

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Various claims are being amended as shown above. The claim amendments clarify the claim language and are not intended to limit the scope of the claims, unless the claim language is expressly quoted in the following remarks to distinguish over the cited art.

No new matter is being added by virtue of the amendment to the claims. Support for the amendment to the claims can be found in, for example, Figures 2A and 2B and associated text in the specification.

In section 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 8, 22-24, 32, and 33 and 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Brewer (USP 3,788,071) or Choksi (USP 5,727,594). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 1 distinguishes over Brewer or Choksi, at least by reciting, a check valve including a cut *"wherein the cut includes a bevel on an edge of the cut so that the bevel would interfere with another bevel of another cut of the check valve in order to prevent the central region from extending past the outer region in the direction of the flow in the reverse direction"*, and such recited features are not disclosed or suggested in Brewer or Choksi.

Claim 24 distinguishes over Brewer or Choksi, at least by reciting, a method of preventing reverse air flow *"wherein the check valve includes a cut with a bevel on an edge of the"*, and such recited features are not disclosed or suggested in Brewer or Choksi.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 24 are each patentable over Brewer or Choksi.

Claims 8, 22-23, and 32-33 depend from one of claims 1 and 24 and are patentable over Brewer or Choksi for at least the same reasons their respective base claim is patentable over the same references.

Each of the claims 8, 22-23, and 32-33 distinguishes over Brewer or Choksi by reciting additional features.

Accordingly, each of the claims 8, 22-23, and 32-33 is patentable over Brewer or Choksi.

For the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102.

In section 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 19-27, and 32-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Pettit et al. (USP 5,890,959. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 1 distinguishes over Pettit, at least by reciting, a check valve including a cut *"wherein the cut includes a bevel on an edge of the cut so that the bevel would interfere with another bevel of another cut of the check valve in order to prevent the central region from extending past the outer region in the direction of the flow in the reverse direction"*, and such recited features are not disclosed or suggested in Pettit.

Independent claim 19 distinguishes over Pettit, at least by reciting, a cooling mechanism *"wherein the cut includes a bevel on an edge of the cut so that the bevel would interfere with another bevel of another cut of the*

check valve in order to prevent the central region from extending past the outer region in the direction of the flow in the reverse direction", and such recited features are not disclosed or suggested in Pettit.

Claim 24 distinguishes over Pettit, at least by reciting, a method of preventing reverse air flow "*wherein the check valve includes a cut with a bevel on an edge of the*", and such recited features are not disclosed or suggested in Pettit.

Accordingly, claims 1, 19 and 24 are each patentable over Pettit.

Claims 2-4, 20-23, 25-27, and 32-22 depend from one of claims 1, 19 and 24 and are patentable over Pettit for at least the same reasons their respective base claim is patentable over the same reference.

Each of the claims 2-4, 20-23, 25-27, and 32-22 distinguishes over Pettit by reciting additional features.

Accordingly, each of the claims 2-4, 20-23, 25-27, and 32-22 is patentable over Pettit.

For the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102.

In section 4 of the Office Action, claims 9, 10, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being unpatentable over Baddour et al. (USP 6,031,717) in view of Official Notice. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 9 distinguishes over Baddour, at least by reciting, a method of preventing reverse air flow

"wherein the check valve includes a cut with a bevel on an edge of the cut", and such recited features are not disclosed or suggested in Baddour.

Independent claim 19 distinguishes over Pettit, at least by reciting, a cooling mechanism "wherein the cut includes a bevel on an edge of the cut so that the bevel would interfere with another bevel of another cut of the check valve in order to prevent the central region from extending past the outer region in the direction of the flow in the reverse direction", and such recited features are not disclosed or suggested in Pettit.

Claim 13 distinguishes over Baddour, at least by reciting, a check valve "wherein the check valve includes a cut with a bevel on an edge of the cut", and such recited features are not disclosed or suggested in Baddour.

Accordingly, claims 9 and 13 are each patentable over Baddour.

Claims 10 and 14 depend from one of claims 9 and 13 and are patentable over Baddour for at least the same reasons their respective base claim is patentable over the same reference.

Each of the claims 10 and 14 distinguishes over Baddour by reciting additional features.

Accordingly, each of the claims 10 and 14 is patentable over Baddour.

For the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102.

In section 7 of the Office Action, claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Pettit et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As noted above, independent claim 1 is patentable over Pettit for at least various reasons.

Claim 8 depend from claim 1 and is patentable over Pettit for at least the same reasons that its base claim is patentable over the same reference.

Claim 8 further distinguishes over Pettit by reciting additional features.

Accordingly, claim 8 is patentable over Pettit.

For the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

In section 8 of the Office Action, claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Baddour as applied to claims 9, 10, 13, and 14 above and further in view of either Choksi or Brewer. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As noted above, independent claim 9 is patentable over Baddour for at least various reasons.

Claim 12 depend from claim 9 and is patentable over the Baddour-Choksi-Brewer combination for at least the same reasons that its base claim is patentable over the same references.

Claim 12 further distinguishes over the Baddour-Choksi-Brewer combination by reciting additional features.

Furthermore, it would not have been obvious to modify Baddour with Choksi or Brewer because the proposed combination would require a substantial reconstruction and redesign of the elements disclosed in the primary reference. (See MPEP 2143.01). For example, there is no suggestion in the references on how to modify the elements in the references so that the elements in Baddour can function with the elements of Choksi or Brewer. Furthermore, Baddour and Choksi and Brewer do not suggest or disclose any interface circuitry, modules, systems, methods, and/or techniques that permit the elements disclosed in Baddour to function with the elements disclosed in Choksi or Brewer. Therefore, the modification of Baddour, as suggested in the Office Action, is improper.

Accordingly, claim 8 is patentable over the Baddour-Choksi-Brewer combination.

For the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 1-14 and 19-33 remain in this application.

If the undersigned attorney has overlooked a teaching in any of the cited references that is relevant to the allowability of the claims, the Examiner is respectfully requested to specifically point out where such teachings may be found.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

CONTACT INFORMATION

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (805) 681-5078.

Date: May 7, 2004

Respectfully submitted,
David Onstenk, et al.

By: Arnold M. de Guzman
Attorney for Applicant(s)
deGuzman & Associates, PC
Reg. No. 39,955
805.681.5078
805.681.5076 (FAX)

Please send correspondence to:
IP Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence, including the enclosures identified herein, is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below. If the Express Mail Mailing Number is filled in below, then this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.10.			
Signature:			
Typed or Printed Name:	Arnold M. de Guzman, Reg. No. 39,955	Dated:	May 7, 2004
Express Mail Mailing Number (optional):			